

## REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 12-21 are now pending in the application, with claim 12 being the only independent claim. Claims 1-11 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 12-21 are newly presented. Support for these new claims can be found throughout the originally-filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants submit the new claims do not include new matter.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 7-9 were objected to for minor informalities. As these claims have been cancelled herein, Applicants submit that these objections have been obviated. Nevertheless, Applicants have noted the language the Office Action objected to, and have not included such language in the new claims presented herein.

Claims 1, 2, and 5-11 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazawa et al. (EP 1243624 A1) in view of Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,990,227). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakazawa et al. in view of Takizawa et al., further in view of Ma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,808 B1).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and solely to advance prosecution, Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-11. Further, Applicants submit the cited references fail to teach or suggest new Claims 21-21, for at least the foregoing reasons.

The Office Action alleges Nakazawa et al. discloses a set of a first liquid composition and a second liquid composition. The Office Action acknowledges, however, that Nakazawa et al. does not disclose the organic acid groups of the copolymers to be different in pKa, and that the amphiphilic copolymer contained in the first liquid composition becomes viscous by pH change of the first liquid composition on contact with the second liquid composition that is different in pH from the first liquid composition.

Applicants agree with the characterization in the Office Action that Nakazawa et al. does not disclose the organic acid groups of the copolymers to be different in pKa and that the amphiphilic copolymer contained in the first liquid composition becomes viscous by pH change of the first liquid composition on contact with the second liquid composition that is different in pH from the first liquid composition. Along these lines, Applicants submit Nakazawa et al. does not disclose “a pH and a pKa of an organic acid group or a salt of the copolymer of the first liquid composition being different than a pH and a pKa an organic acid group or a salt of the copolymer of the second liquid composition,” as recited in Claim 12 of the present application.

Applicants further note that Nakazawa et al. discloses a method for increasing the viscosity of the first liquid composition by including a crosslinking agent in the second liquid composition that can react to form a complex with the block copolymer of the first liquid composition, when the two compositions are contacted, thereby generating a network structure. Nakazawa et al., paragraph [0011].

The Office Action further alleges Takizawa et al. discloses organic groups of copolymers being different in pKa, and that the copolymer of a first liquid composition becoming viscous by a pH change of the first liquid composition upon contact with a second liquid composition which is different in pH from the first liquid composition. The Office Action concludes, therefore, that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the liquid set disclosed by Nakazawa et al. with this disclosure of Takizawa et al. in order to even image density and prevent bleeding.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that there is no motivation to modify Nakazawa et al. with the teachings of Takizawa et al. in the manner suggested in the Office Action. As noted above, Nakazawa et al. alone discloses a method for increasing the viscosity of the first liquid composition by including a cross linking agent in the second liquid composition. Thus, there would be no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to look to Takizawa et al. for a viscosity increasing process in order to even image density

and prevent bleeding (as the Office Action asserts), as Nakazawa et al. already discloses such a viscosity increasing process.

Applicants further submit that the modification of Nakazawa et al. with the disclosure of Takizawa et al. in the manner suggested in the Office Action would, in fact, require such an alternating of the compositions of Nakazawa et al., that Nakazawa et al. would no longer work for its intended purpose. If proposed modification would render a reference being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In this case, Nakazawa et al. discloses the contacting an ink composition with an aqueous solution such as polyacrylic acid in order to achieve the cross-linking/increased viscosity reaction and produce a resultant ink composition. See, e.g., Nakazawa et al., paragraphs [0116] - [0118]. Takizawa et al., on the other hand, contacting two ink compositions together in order to achieve the increased viscosity reaction and produce a resultant ink composition. Takizawa et al., col. 2, lines 54-62. Thus, to modify Nakazawa et al. with Takizawa et al.'s viscosity increasing method would required a drastic change in the resultant compositions of Nakazawa et al., that is, from an ink and aqueous solution mixture to a mixture of two inks, so as to thereby change the resultant ink composition. Such a fundamental change in compositions of Nakazawa et al. would necessarily change the resultant ink composition, thereby dissuading one of ordinary skill in the art from making a change.

Applicants further submit that the further citation to Ma et al. fails to cure the above noted-deficiencies of Nakazawa et al. and Takizawa et al. Ma et al. was cited in the Office Action for allegedly suggesting certain features of dependent claims. Even if Ma et al. can be understood to teach these features, the resultant combination Nakazawa et al. and Takizawa et al. and Ma et al. would still not render obvious independent Claim 12, for at least the reasons described above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the references of Nakazawa et al., Takizawa et al., and Ma et al. do not render teach or suggest a method, as recited independent Claim 12.

Claims 13-21 depend directly from independent Claim 12 and are therefore allowable for reasons noted above with respect to Claim 12. In addition, each of these claims recite features of the invention still further distinguishing it from the cited references. Favorable and independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully sought.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in Washington, D.C. at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DHH:ayr